

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NEIL D. LEWIS,)	ORDER TO AMEND DEFICIENT
)	COMPLAINT, & MEMORANDUM
Plaintiff,)	DECISION
)	
v.)	Case No. 2:11-CV-1125 TS
)	
DR. WILCOX et al.,)	District Judge Ted Stewart
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, inmate Neil D. Lewis, filed this *pro se* civil rights suit, see 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 (2012), *in forma pauperis*, see 28 id. § 1915. The Court now screens the complaint and orders Plaintiff to file an amended complaint to cure deficiencies before further pursuing his claims.

Deficiencies in Complaint

Complaint:

- (a) names only one defendant in the caption and text, although he intimates there are more possible defendants by stating the caption as "Dr. Wilcox et al., defendant(s)."
- (b) inappropriately alleges civil-rights violations against Dr. Wilcox on a respondeat-superior theory.
- (c) is not on a court-approved form complaint as required.
- (d) has claims apparently regarding current confinement; however, the complaint was not submitted through contract attorneys.

Instructions to Plaintiff

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a complaint to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction . . .; (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a demand for the relief sought." Rule 8's requirements mean to guarantee "that defendants enjoy fair notice of what the claims against them are and the grounds upon which they rest." *TV Commc'ns Network, Inc. v ESPN, Inc.*, 767 F. Supp. 1062, 1069 (D. Colo. 1991).

Pro se litigants are not excused from complying with these minimal pleading demands. "This is so because a pro se plaintiff requires no special legal training to recount the facts surrounding his alleged injury, and he must provide such facts if the court is to determine whether he makes out a claim on which relief can be granted." *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). Moreover, it is improper for the Court "to assume the role of advocate for a pro se litigant." *Id.* Thus, the Court cannot "supply additional facts, [or] construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded." *Dunn v. White*, 880 F.2d 1188, 1197 (10th Cir. 1989).

Plaintiff should consider the following points before refiling his complaint. First, the revised complaint must stand

entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of the original complaint. See *Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (stating amended complaint supercedes original).

Second, the complaint must clearly state what each defendant did to violate Plaintiff's civil rights. See *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (stating personal participation of each named defendant is essential allegation in civil rights action). "To state a claim, a complaint must 'make clear exactly who is alleged to have done what to whom.'" *Stone v. Albert*, No. 08-2222, slip op. at 4 (10th Cir. July 20, 2009) (unpublished) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)).

Third, Plaintiff cannot name an individual as a defendant based solely on his or her supervisory position. See *Mitchell v. Maynard*, 80 F.2d 1433, 1441 (10th Cir. 1996) (stating supervisory status alone does not support § 1983 liability). Further, "denial of a grievance, by itself without any connection to the violation of constitutional rights alleged by plaintiff, does not establish personal participation under § 1983." *Gallagher v. Shelton*, No. 09-3113, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 25787, at *11 (10th Cir. Nov. 24, 2009).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

(1) Plaintiff must within thirty days cure the deficiencies noted above.

(2) The Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff a copy of the Pro Se Litigant Guide.

(3) If Plaintiff fails to timely cure the above deficiencies according to this Order's instructions, this action will be dismissed without further notice.

DATED this 24th day of April, 2012.

BY THE COURT:



CHIEF JUDGE TED STEWART
United States District Court